

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	Chokecherry Cattle Inc / Stockwater Pipeline
Proposed	
Implementation Date:	May, 2014
Proponent:	Chokecherry Cattle Inc
Location:	Section 36, Township 3 South – Range 8 West (Trust is Common Schools)
County:	Beaverhead County

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

Chokecherry Cattle Inc. is proposing the extension of an existing stock water pipeline that is currently used to fill an existing stock water tank on state land and extending it by approximately 4,700 feet on State land. The new underground 11/4 inch HDPE pipeline will transport water to a new a stock water tank on to deeded property owned by Chokecherry Cattle Inc.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

MT DNRC Archeologist, Patrick Rennie
Madison County Commissioners
BLM Dillon Field Office
NRIS Search
Vanna Boccadori, Fish Wildlife & Parks Biologist

2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:

No other government permits are needed for this proposal.

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Action Alternative: Grant Chokecherry Cattle Inc a Land Use License (LUL) to plow and install a new underground stock water pipe line (11/4" HDPE pipeline) to gravity feed water from an existing stock tank and extend the pipeline to a new tank on deeded ground.

No Action Alternative: Deny Chokecherry Cattle Inc a Land Use License to plow and install a new underground stock water pipe line (11/4" HDPE pipeline) to gravity feed water from an existing stock tank and extend the pipeline to a new tank on deeded ground.

III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered. Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading. Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:

Consider the presence of fragile, compactable or unstable soils. Identify unusual geologic features. Specify any special reclamation considerations. Identify any cumulative impacts to soils.

NRCS soil survey identifies the soils where the boring and installation of pipeline would occur is Musselshell loam. The parent material of this soil is coarse-loamy alluvium which is derived from limestone. The land capability of the soil is rated 4e and these soils are considered well drained.

The action alternative if done during dry conditions would have very little ground disturbance and any affects to soil conditions would be small and short lived. The pipe would be bored in using a dozer with a boring device that buries the pipeline with little disturbance to the, soils, vegetation or surface of the ground.

No long term or cumulative effects to soil productivity, compaction or soil erosion would occur from either alternative.

5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:

Identify important surface or groundwater resources. Consider the potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality. Identify cumulative effects to water resources.

There isn't any surface water present on the section except for an existing stockwater tank that is located on the state land. This proposal would tap into the line that feeds this stockwater tank and extend it to a new tank on deeded property. Neither alternative would affect groundwater, ambient water quality standards, and drinking water contaminants or degrade water quality.

No long term or cumulative effects are anticipated from either of the proposed alternatives.

6. AIR QUALITY:

What pollutants or particulate would be produced? Identify air quality regulations or zones (e.g. Class I air shed) the project would influence. Identify cumulative effects to air quality.

Neither alternative would create any significant air particulate problem. The location is not located in an area identified as a non attainment zone for air quality standards.

No long term or cumulative effects to air quality are anticipated from either alternative.

7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:

What changes would the action cause to vegetative communities? Consider rare plants or cover types that would be affected. Identify cumulative effects to vegetation.

No long term or cumulative effects are anticipated from either of the proposed alternatives.

8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:

Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

A variety of big game, small mammals, raptors and songbirds potentially use this area. There are no known fish-bearing streams within the immediate vicinity of the proposed project area.

No long term or cumulative effects are anticipated to occur to wildlife, birds or fish or their habitat if the Action Alternative is chosen. The pipeline would be underground and ground disturbance would be minimal.

The No Action Alternative would have no effect on wildlife, birds or fish, and no cumulative effects to wildlife would occur if chosen.

9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:
Consider any federally listed threatened or endangered species or habitat identified in the project area. Determine effects to wetlands. Consider Sensitive Species or Species of special concern. Identify cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

No sensitive species were identified as using this state section by Natural Heritage Program.

Neither of the available alternatives would have any long term or cumulative effects to wildlife, birds or fish or sensitive species or their habitat.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:
Identify and determine effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

Patrick Rennie the MT DNRC Archeologist was consulted about this proposal and he didn't have any cultural resource concerns associated with the action alternative. No cultural resources have ever been identified on this section during field evaluations. Because of this neither of the alternatives would have any effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

If the action alternative is implemented a mitigation clause would be included in the LUL stating that the contractor would be required to stop installation of the pipeline if any cultural resources are identified during the boring of the underground pipe line. The state Archeologist would be contacted and the site would be evaluated before construction activity could resume.

The No Action Alternative would have no long term or cumulative effects on archaeological or paleontological resources.

11. AESTHETICS:
Determine if the project is located on a prominent topographic feature, or may be visible from populated or scenic areas. What level of noise, light or visual change would be produced? Identify cumulative effects to aesthetics.

The project is located in an isolated area away from any population. No long term or cumulative effects to aesthetics are anticipated from either of the proposed alternatives for this proposal.

12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:
Determine the amount of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify cumulative effects to environmental resources.

No direct, indirect or cumulative effects to environmental resources should result from either the Action or No Action alternatives.

13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA:
List other studies, plans or projects on this tract. Determine cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of current private, state or federal actions in the analysis area, and from future proposed state actions in the analysis area that are under MEPA review (scoped) or permitting review by any state agency.

The DNRC is not aware of any other environmental documents being examined for projects in this analysis area or any other MEPA review being performed at this time.

IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered. Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading. Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:
Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

Neither the Action nor No Action alternative will pose any known human health or safety risks or cause any long term or cumulative effects to human health or safety.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:
Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.

The project will not alter any current use patterns dealing with agricultural use. Grazing of livestock will continue as before, with possible better utilization of forage and dispersion of livestock over the landscape due to the additional stock tank.

16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:
Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to the employment market.

Neither of the proposed alternatives will alter current employment numbers in the Glen, MT area.

17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:
Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.

Neither of the proposed alternatives will alter the current local or state tax base in Madison County or the state of Montana.

18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:
Estimate increases in traffic and changes to traffic patterns. What changes would be needed to fire protection, police, schools, etc.? Identify cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services.

Neither of the proposed alternatives will increase demands on government services.

19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:
List State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, and other zoning or management plans, and identify how they would affect this project.

There are no known environmental plans or zoning requirements in place for the affected area at this time.

20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:
Identify any wilderness or recreational areas nearby or access routes through this tract. Determine the effects of the project on recreational potential within the tract. Identify cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

Persons having legal access to the tracts and possessing a valid state lands recreational use license or FWP conservation license may conduct recreational activities on the tracts. The proposed project would not affect access for the general public. This area receives some hunting pressure during the big game hunting season. Currently there aren't any designated open roads on the state section, but this doesn't stop recreationist from

using the area via motorized vehicles. There is some concern that installing the pipeline could cause additional off road travel to occur because often recreationists will drive areas that look like new trails. Mitigation measures would include putting up signs, or barriers to restrict and discourage off road use.

The No Action Alternative would not have any effect on recreational use activities on this state section.

21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:
Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify cumulative effects to population and housing.

Neither of the proposed alternatives will affect density and distribution of population and housing.

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:
Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

The Action Alternative is congruent with current social structures and mores in Southwestern Montana. Ranching and livestock production are the main economic drivers in Madison County and this project would continue to promote these traditional lifestyles.

The No Action Alternative would not affect social structures or mores of Southwestern Montana.

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:
How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

Under the Action Alternative the stock water pipeline would be installed and will not be visible once the disturbed vegetation grows back. This would not affect the cultural uniqueness and diversity of the surrounding area. No long term or cumulative effects to cultural uniqueness and diversity would occur.

Under the No Action Alternative no effects to cultural uniqueness and diversity would occur.

24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:
Estimate the return to the trust. Include appropriate economic analysis. Identify potential future uses for the analysis area other than existing management. Identify cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

The Action Alternative would generate \$150.00 every ten years for the common school trust.

The No Action Alternative would not generate any revenue for the trust.

EA Checklist
Prepared By:

Name: Tim Egan
Title: Dillon Unit Manager

Date: April 17, 2014

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:
Action Alternative

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:
The completion of this EA checklist did not document impacts that could not be reasonable be mitigated.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

☐

EIS

☐

More Detailed EA

☐

No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name:	Hoyt Richards
	Title:	Area Manager, Central Land Office
Signature: /s/		Date: April 22, 2014

